



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/293,266	04/16/1999	RAYMOND WALDEN BENNETT III	A00513	4651

757 7590 08/28/2003

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER

AGDEPPA, HECTOR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

31

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/293,266

Applicant(s)

BENNETT III ET AL.

Examiner

Hector A. Agdeppa

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon in view of Mirville et al.

As to claims 1 – 4, 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 17, and 19, Brandon teaches an automated telephone directory for creating outgoing call logs wherefrom called numbers and/or the names associated with the called numbers may be displayed display 3 of telephone 1, retrieved, and dialed by a single input made by depressing call key 82. (Abstract, Figs. 1, 4 – 7, Col. 2, lines 32 – 67, Col. 3, line 54 – Col. 4, line 34, and Col. 5, line 7 – Col. 6, line 64)

However, it is able old and well known that service residing in/on a telephone unit may be provided at a central office (C.O.) or switch, the functionality no longer residing with the telephone, but within the C.O. or switch requiring a caller to dial a service code to invoke a feature and presenting any information via audio messaging. Examples of this are voice mail (as opposed to an answering machine) and remote access speed dialing (as opposed to local speed dialing, i.e., database kept in switch as opposed to being kept in telephone unit) such as the system for on-demand communications services taught by Mirville et al.

Mirville et al. teach a caller using telephone or end unit 101, 103, 105 to dial a service code such as #1 to access the speed dial feature and wherein the list of speed dial numbers resides in a storage device 190 separate from units 101, 103, or 105. (Figs. 1, 3, 4, Col. 6, lines 28 – 54)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to implement the invention of Brandon in the manner taught by Mirville et al., i.e. functionality residing away from the telephone, making it thus necessary to dial a service code and receive relevant information via audio messaging inasmuch as it is old and well known to implement telephony features in either environment. Furthermore, keeping an outgoing call log in a C.O. or switch allows for more memory and therefore a more extensive outgoing call log may be kept. Also, situations arise if outgoing call logs kept only on telephone unit wherein if a caller has multiple telephones, that caller must use the same telephone previously used in order to redial a previously called number, because there is no way for that previously dialed number to be transferred to another telephone. Also, because,

Art Unit: 2642

often, listening to audio messages, in particular, those reciting lists are difficult to remember and use information contained therein, visually displaying lists is favored. However, many telephones commonly used today still do not display information and thus, lists would have to be presented via audio messaging. Furthermore, such is simply an issue of preference or design choice as to whether an outgoing call list is to be presented visually or via audio messaging. Also, to that point, a blind caller would have to have information normally visually displayed, converted to audio or Braille, in either case, requiring converting data into a preferred format and such conversions are old and well known in the art, again making the modification of Brandon's invention from a visual apparatus to an audio apparatus obvious to one skilled in the art.

2. Claims 5, 7, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon in view of Mirville et al. and further in view of Levine.

As to claims 5, 12, and 18, Brandon and Mirville et al. have been discussed above. What they do not teach is the use of a vertical service code.

However, any type of service code used to access a service or feature is a question of preference or design choice making the use of a vertical service code obvious to one skilled in the art. Furthermore, as taught by Levine, vertical service codes are old and well known in the art and it would again be obvious to access radial features of the claimed invention using such. (Col. 12, lines 1 – 46 of Levine)

As to claim 7, Brandon teaches displaying outgoing call lists one page at a time. If this were translated into audio, it is obvious if not inherent that call lists would be presented in blocks likened to pages, perhaps 4 numbers at a time to make it easier for

Art Unit: 2642

a user to utilize redial feature or at least present numbers one at a time, requiring a user to somehow prompt a next number to be presented. Therefore, the page scrolling taught by Brandon would be translated into the first and second audio messages and multiple dial inputs of the claimed invention. Also, as discussed above, as in the case of voice mail or many other services provided remotely to a user, a PIN would be necessary and thus it is obvious if not inherent to require the inputting of a PIN as claimed by the instant invention.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's amendments further limit the invention to "using a telephone network element that is disposed in a publicly switched telephone network." Such is taught by Mirville et al. with regards to speed dialing, automatic callback, or other contemplated features. See above discussion as well as Fig. 4 where it is clearly shown to have an "X feature" denoting other features that might be implemented. Presenting a list of recently dialed numbers is a very old and well known feature, especially with regards to wireless telephones. Such a feature also became possible when caller ID was presented to consumers. Furthermore, merely moving functionality from a telephone to the PSTN is old and well known and has motivation in either speed of the system's operation or preferences in design or desired efficiency or resource allocation. Therefore, examiner maintains the assertion that the present invention is obvious.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2642

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Pat 5,272,748 (Davis) teaches enhanced speed dialing wherein the service resides/is controlled by a network element disposed in the PSTN as opposed to residing merely on a stand-alone telephone unit.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hector A. Agdeppa whose telephone number is 703-305-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Fri 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 703-305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

H.A.A.
August 22, 2003

Harry S. Hong
HARRY S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER